

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16. By this amendment, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Therefore claims 1-16 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 13 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al (U.S. patent 5,506,697). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Li et al disclose an apparatus for processing documents that includes pages containing a single two-dimensional bar code symbol. The bar codes include information about the documents that allows reproduction of the original documents.

The present invention does not use a single bar code on a page; rather, the present invention employs location-indicating coded data that is generally dispersed over an entire page or a wide region of a page. The coded-data is then used to identify the position of a sensing device relative to the page.

The Examiner stated that Li et al disclose, at col. 3, lines 46-60, the limitation of claim 1 of “the coded data including ...the location of at least one reference point on the document.” However, those lines of Li et al refer only to locations on an original document such as margins and tab settings; those lines do not refer to reference points on a present document that can be used to locate a sensing device relative to the document.

The present claims have herein been amended so as to clarify the above distinctions between the present invention and the disclosure of Li et al. In particular, the limitation of “wherein the received indicating data is used to determine which reference points on the document the stroke intersects” has been added to clarify that the reference points on the document are used to specifically locate strokes made by the sensing device.

Support for the above amendments is found in the specification as filed at page 15, lines 7-18, wherein the sensing device is referred to as a “pen”:

“The netpage printer 601 receives data relating to a stroke from the pen 101 when the pen is used to interact with a netpage 1. The coded data 3 of the tags 4 is read by the pen when it is used to execute a movement, such as a stroke. The data allows the identity of the particular page and associated interactive element to be determined and an indication of the relative positioning of the pen relative to the page to be obtained. The indicating data is transmitted to the printer, where it resolves, via the DNS, the page ID 50 of the stroke into the network address of the netpage page server 10 which maintains the corresponding page instance 830. It then transmits the stroke to the page server. If the page was recently identified in an earlier stroke, then the printer may already have the address of the relevant page server in its cache. Each netpage consists of a compact page layout maintained persistently by a netpage page server (see below). The page layout refers to objects such as images, fonts and pieces of text, typically stored elsewhere on the netpage network.

When the page server receives the stroke from the pen, it retrieves the page description to which the stroke applies, and determines which element of the page description the stroke intersects. It is then able to interpret the stroke in the context of the type of the relevant element.” (Underlining added.)

The Applicants assert that the interaction described immediately above is not disclosed or fairly suggested by Li et al. Further, the Applicants assert that the above interaction is now adequately defined in the presently amended claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103


Claims 2-4, 7, 11-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie et al in view of Uchida et al (US patent 6,327,610).

The Applicants assert that these remaining rejections of the Examiner to the dependent claims are now moot in light of the above amendments and arguments. As stated in the previous response, Uchida et al disclose a system for receiving, manipulating, and printing electronic mail, where the electronic mail is printed using only ordinary printers that do not print coded data readable by an optically imaging sensing device. Further, Uchida et al do not disclose a sensing device that reads coded data printed on a document in order to determine a location of the sensing device relative to the document.

Because the limitations of the presently amended claims are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art cited by the Examiner, and because the present amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



PAUL LAPSTUN



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.Silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762